

**REMARKS**

Claims 24-54 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 24-54 are rejected. Claims 25, 32 and 45 are canceled. Claims 24, 26, 30, 33, 43 and 46 are amended. Claims 24, 26-31, 33-44 and 46-54 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 24-26, 28-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 43, 45, 46, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,141,760 to Abadi et al. ("Abadi") in view of Menezes, "Handbook of Applied Cryptography," 1997, p. 390 ("Menezes"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

According to MPEP §2131, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.' (Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). 'The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.' (Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an ipsissimis verbis test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. (In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990))."

Applicant's amended claim 24 contains the limitations of "[a] method performed by a machine comprising: receiving a user password; receiving a user identification; receiving a name of an independent software application that requires a password for a user to use the software application; determining a specific randomly generated salt value only associated with the software application; computing a software application dependent password for a user, wherein the software application dependent password

depends on the user password, the user identification and the randomly generated salt value for the software application; and returning the software application dependent password to the software application, wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the software application for a predetermined time period."

Applicant's amended claim 30 contains the limitations of "[a] method performed by a machine comprising: generating a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password; generating a password from the hash; and returning the password to the software application to gain entry to the software application, wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the specific software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the specific software application for a predetermined time period."

Applicant's amended claim 43 contains the limitations of "[a] program storage device readable by a machine comprising instructions that cause the machine to: generate a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password; generate a password from the hash; and return the password to a user to gain entry to the software application, wherein the user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is generated each time a user requests access to the specific software application."

Abadi discloses generating passwords for password controlled access points. Abadi uses a master password, an access password and a user name. The master password, service name and user name are combined using an irreversible function, e.g., a hash function, to generate a unique password. Abadi, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest "determining a specific randomly generated salt value only associated with the software application; ... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the software application for a predetermined time period," "generating a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password; generating a password from the hash; ... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the specific software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the specific software application for a predetermined time period," or "generate a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password; ... wherein the user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is generated each time a user requests access to the specific software application."

Therefore, since Abadi does not disclose, teach or suggest all of Applicant's amended claims 24, 30 and 43 limitations, Applicant respectfully asserts that a *prima facie* rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has not been adequately set forth relative to Abadi. Thus, Applicant's amended claims 24, 30 and 43 are not anticipated by Abadi. Additionally, the claims that directly or indirectly depend on claims 24, 30 and 43, namely claims 26 and 28-29, 33 and 35-38, and 46 and 48-50, respectively, are also not anticipated by Abadi for the same reason.

Menezes discloses basic encryption techniques, such as slowing down password mapping, salting passwords and extending passwords to passphrases. Menezes, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest "determining a specific randomly generated salt value only associated with the software application; ... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the software application for a predetermined time period," "generating a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password; generating a password from the hash; ... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the specific software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the specific software application for a predetermined time period," or "generate a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password; ... wherein the user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is generated each time a user requests access to the specific software application."

Therefore, since Menezes does not disclose, teach or suggest all of Applicant's amended claims 24, 30 and 43 limitations, Applicant respectfully asserts that a *prima facie* rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has not been adequately set forth relative to Menezes. Thus, Applicant's amended claims 24, 30 and 43 are not anticipated by Menezes. Additionally, the claims that directly or indirectly depend on claims 24, 30 and 43, namely claims 25-26 and 28-29, 32, 33 and 35-38, and 45-46 and 48-50, respectively, are also not anticipated by Menezes for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections for claims 24-26, 28-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 43, 45, 46, and 48-50 are respectfully requested.

**II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 27 is rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abadi in view of Menezes as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,719,941 issued to Swift et al. ("Swift"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

According to MPEP §2142 "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure." (In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). Further, according to MPEP §2143.03, "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974))." *"All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."* (In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970), emphasis added.)

As discussed above in section I, neither Abadi nor Menezes teach, disclose or suggest the limitations contained in amended claim 24, from which claim 27 directly depends, of "determining a specific randomly generated salt value only associated with the software application; ... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the software application and temporarily

stored a first time the user requests access to the software application for a predetermined time period.”

Swift discloses a method for changing an account password stored at a physically remote location. A user submits both an old and a new password to its client machine and the client computes two message values. The first message is computed by encrypting the new password using a one-way hash of the old password as an encryption key. The second message is computed by encrypting the one-way hash of the old password using a one-way hash of the new clear text password as the encryption key. The server computes a first decrypted value by decrypting the first message using the one-way hash of the old password, previously stored at the server, as the decryption key. The server computes a second decrypted value by decrypting the second message using a one-way hash of the first decrypted value as the decryption key. The server compares the decrypted one-way hashed value, transmitted in encrypted form in the second message, to the pre-stored hashed old password. If the two values are equal, then the server replaces the old password by the new password.

Swift, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest “determining a specific randomly generated salt value only associated with the software application; ... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the software application for a predetermined time period.”

Therefore, even if Abadi and Menezes were combined with Swift, the resulting invention would still not include all of Applicant’s claimed limitations. Since neither Abadi, Menezes, Swift nor the combination of the three, teach, disclose or suggest all the limitations of Applicant’s amended claim 24, as listed above, there would not be any motivation to arrive at Applicant’s claimed invention. Thus, Applicant’s amended claim 24 is not obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes and further in view of Swift since a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met under MPEP §2142. Additionally, the claim that indirectly depends from amended claim 24, namely claim

27, would also not be obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes and further in view of Swift for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for claim 27 is respectfully requested.

B. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 31 and 44 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,760 to Abadi et al. in view of Menezes, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,006,333 issued to Nielson ("Nielson"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 31 directly depends on amended claim 30. Applicant's claim 44 directly depends on amended claim 43. Applicant has discussed Abadi and Menezes above in section I regarding amended claims 30 and 43.

Nielsen discloses a user operating a client system can access multiple remote servers that each require distinct passwords with a master password. Nielsen, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest "generating a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password;... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the specific software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the specific software application for a predetermined time period" or "generate a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password;... wherein the user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is generated each time a user requests access to the specific software application."

Therefore, even if Abadi and Menezes were combined with Nielsen, the resulting invention would still not include all of Applicant's claimed limitations. Since neither Abadi, Menezes, Swift nor the combination of the three, teach, disclose or suggest all the limitations of Applicant's amended claims 30 and 43, as listed above, there would not be any motivation to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, Applicant's amended claims 30 and 43 are not obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes and further in view of Nielsen since a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met under MPEP §2142. Additionally, the claims that directly depends from amended claims 30 and 43, namely claims 31, and 44, respectively, would also not be obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes and further in view of Nielsen for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for claims 31 and 44 is respectfully requested.

C. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 39 and 51 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,064,736 issued to Davis et al. ("Davis "). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 39 directly depends on amended claim 30. Applicant's claim 51 directly depends on amended claim 43. Applicant has discussed Abadi and Menezes above in section I regarding amended claims 30 and 43.

Davis discloses a two party key authentication and verification where data is allowed to flow between a client and a server after verification. Davis discloses that a nonce and the User ID of the client is sent to the server where the server creates a random secret value to be used in a DES algorithm to set up the encrypted session. The nonce in Davis, if compared to a randomly generated salt in Applicant's claimed invention, is not a particular nonce that is associated with a specific software application. In fact, since a nonce is based on time or can be a time stamp, it is hardly likely that a particular nonce could ever be associated with a specific software application repeatedly. Moreover, Davis does not teach, disclose or suggest "generating a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a



specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password;... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the specific software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the specific software application for a predetermined time period" or "generate a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password;... wherein the user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is generated each time a user requests access to the specific software application."

Therefore, since Davis does not disclose, teach or suggest all of Applicant's amended claims 30 and 43 limitations, Applicant respectfully asserts that a *prima facie* rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has not been adequately set forth relative to Davis. Thus, Applicant's amended claims 30 and 43 are not anticipated by Davis. Additionally, the claims that directly or indirectly depend on claims 30 and 43, namely claims 39, and 51, respectively, are also not anticipated by Davis for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for claims 39 and 51 is respectfully requested.

D. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 40-42 and 52-54 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 6,601,175 issued to Arnold et al. ("Arnold"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claims 40-42 depend on amended claim 30. Claims 52-54 depend on amended claim 43. Applicant has discussed Abadi and Menezes above in section I.

Arnold discloses a data processing system features are protected using a machine-specific limited-life password. The data processing system includes execution resources for executing a watchdog program, a limited-life value generator, and non-volatile storage that stores a machine-specific value partially derived from relatively unique information associated with the data processing system, such as a secret control password. The limited-life value can represent a timestamp that limits the duration that the machine-specific limited-life value is valid or a nonce that limits the number of times that the machine-specific limited-life value can be used. Arnold, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest "generating a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password;... wherein a user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is one of computed each time a user requests access to the specific software application and temporarily stored a first time the user requests access to the specific software application for a predetermined time period" or "generate a hash from a particular randomly generated salt value associated with a specific software application and input data, the input data including a user identification and a strong password;... wherein the user does not need to one of remember the software application dependent password and record the software application dependent password as the software application dependent password is generated each time a user requests access to the specific software application."

Therefore, even if Abadi and Menezes were combined with Arnold, the resulting invention would still not include all of Applicant's claimed limitations. Since neither Abadi, Menezes, Arnold nor the combination of the three, teach, disclose or suggest all the limitations of Applicant's amended claims 30 and 43, as listed above, there would not be any motivation to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, Applicant's amended claims 30 and 43 are not obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes and further in view of Arnold since a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met under MPEP §2142. Additionally, the claims that directly depends from amended claims 30 and 43,

namely claims 40-42, and 52-54, respectively, would also not be obvious over Abadi in view of Menezes and further in view of Arnold for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections for claims 40-42 and 52-54 are respectfully requested.